

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending and stand rejected under 35 USC § 103. Applicant appreciates the interview regarding the rejection of the claims although no agreement was reached. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant requests interview

Applicant respectfully requests an interview if it would expedite disposition of the application. The undersigned attorney would welcome and encourage a telephone conference with Examiner at (512) 391-4913.

Claim rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

The Office action rejected claims 1-2, 5, 7-9, 12-13, 15-17, 19, and 21-22 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0047477 (hereinafter referred to as “Chiang”) in view of Simon St. Laurent’s *Cookies*, 1998 (hereinafter referred to as “Laurent”). The Office action rejected claims 3, 14, 18, and 20 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang in view of Laurent and Colby, U.S. Patent No. 6,625,643 (hereinafter referred to as “Colby”) and claims 4 and 10 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang in view of Laurent and Wu, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0068572 (hereinafter referred to as “Wu”). Furthermore, the Office action rejected claims 6 and 11 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang in view of Laurent and Walls, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0156378 (hereinafter referred to as “Walls”).

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the modification or combination must teach or suggest all of Applicants’ claim limitations.<sup>1</sup>

*Chiang in view of Laurent*

---

<sup>1</sup> *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985, 180 USPQ 580, 583 (CCPA 1974).

The combination of Chiang and Laurent fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 because the combination fails to teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations. In particular, the combination fails to teach or suggest storing or retaining the session identification independent of de-allocations of memory for individual applications in a memory location of the embedded system.

The rejections of claims 1, 9, and 17 rely on the teachings of Chiang and Laurent to teach or suggest storing or retaining the session identification independent of de-allocations of memory for individual applications in a memory location of the embedded system. Chiang teaches utilization of session management functionality to track usage of application instances and application variables in a database.<sup>2</sup> Laurent teaches storage of cookies on the user's computer.<sup>3</sup> However, as stated in the Office action, Chiang does not teach or suggest storing or retaining "the session identification independent of de-allocations of memory for individual applications." And Laurent does not address storing or retaining a session in a memory location of the embedded system. Neither Chiang nor Laurent teach or suggest limitations of claims 1, 9, and 17 related to storing or retaining the session identification independent of de-allocations of memory for individual applications in a memory location of the embedded system so the combination of Chiang and Laurent fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1, 9 and 17. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1, 9, and 17, and requests that the claims be allowed.

Claims dependent upon claims 1, 9, and 17 incorporate the limitations of claims 1, 9, and 17. All the rejections of claims dependent upon claims 1, 9, and 17 rely on teachings of Chiang and Laurent to teach or suggest storing or retaining the session identification independent of de-allocations of memory for individual applications in a memory location of the embedded system. Because the combination fails to teach or suggest this, Applicant traverses rejections of claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-22 and requests that claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-22 be allowed.

---

<sup>2</sup> Chiang on pg. 3 at pars. 36-37, pg. 4 at pars. 51 and 54, and fig. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Laurent on pg. 22, at the last Note, in the first sent.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully traverses the cited reference in regards to the claim rejections of claims 1-22 under 35 USC § 103. Accordingly, Applicant believes that this response constitutes a complete response to each of the issues raised in the Office action. In light of the accompanying remarks, Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn, pending claims be allowed, and application advance toward issuance. If it would expedite disposition of the application, the undersigned attorney would welcome and encourage a telephone conference with Examiner at (512) 391-4913.

A petition and fee for an extension of time accompany this action. No other fee is believed due with this paper. However, if any fee is determined to be required, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account 09-0447 for any such required fee.

Respectfully submitted,

December 13, 2007

Date

/Jeffrey S Schubert/

Jeffrey S. Schubert, Reg. No. 43,098  
Customer No.: 45557  
Schubert Osterrieder & Nickelson PLLC  
6013 Cannon Mtn Dr, S14  
Austin, Texas 78749  
(512) 692-7297 (Telephone)  
(512) 301-7301 (Facsimile)  
Attorney for Applicant(s)